

facsimile transmittal

To: Will Hickman **Fax:** 310-820-5988

From: Ex. Tracy Dove **Date:** 6/5/02

Re: Interview Summary 09/595,075 **Pages:** 2

CC:

Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle

Notes: If you have any questions or concerns, please call 703-308-8821. Thank you.

CONFIDENTIAL

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/595,075	Applicant(s) Kweon et al.
	Examiner Tracy Dove	Art Unit 1745

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tracy Dove

(3) Will Hickman

(2) Carol Chaney

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 5, 2002

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: All pending

Identification of prior art discussed:

All pending. Specifically, the Kirino abstract teaches the metal oxide coating is preferably a transition metal oxide coating. An updated search is necessary.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant proposed amending claim 1 to limit the metal "M" of the positive active material to La, Ce or V for each positive active material chemical formula recited in lines 4-5 of claim 1. Any claim drawn to a positive active material (coated with a metal oxide) of any of the formulas recited in lines 4-5 of claim 1 wherein "M" is selected from the group consisting of La, Ce and V appears to be allowable subject matter. Secondly, Applicant proposed amending claim 1 such that the metal oxide coated on the active material "is an oxide of a metal selected from the group consisting of Mg, Si, Al, K, Ca, Na and B". This proposed amendment eliminates all transition metals as the metal of the metal oxide coating and appears to be allowable subject matter. Thirdly, Applicant proposed amending claim 1 by adding the limitation that the active material surface is coated with a metal oxide "by a dip coating method". However, this product-by-process limitation, in the absence of unexpected results, does not overcome the prior art of record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required